

CONYBEARE ON "THE HISTORICAL CHRIST."

BY WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.

INASMUCH as Conybeare's "searching criticism," so far at least as it touches my work (and it would be officious as well as impertinent for me to mingle in his fray with others), concerns itself mainly with details, rarely considering the case on its general merits, the order of the following comments would seem to be prescribed by the order of strictures presented in his book, *The Historical Christ*.

1. Conybeare holds that if Jesus never lived, neither did Solon, nor Epimenides, nor Pythagoras, nor especially Apollonius of Tyana. By what token? The argument is not presented clearly. One cannot infer from the Greek worthies to Jesus, unless there be close parallelism; that there is really any such, who will seriously affirm? By far the strongest example, on which Conybeare seems to rest his case, is that of the Tyanean. But is it a parallel? Certainly and absolutely, No. How much romance may lie in Philostratus's so-called "Life of Apollonius," we need not here discuss, nor the numerous apparent echoes of the Gospels, but all efforts to show that Apollonius is a parallel to Jesus are idle, now as in the days of Hierocles. Let us consider some specimens.

Page 6 of *The Historical Christ* bewilders greatly. One wonders where to find such data,—certainly not in Philostratus. Exaggeration marks nearly every sentence. E.g., "He had a god Proteus for his father." But Philostratus says, "his father bore the same name" (Apollonius), adding that a "phantom of an Egyptian demon came to his mother while pregnant," whom she undismayed asked what she would bear, and who replied, "Me." She asked, "But who are you"? and he answered "Proteus." That is all, and is interpreted by Philostratus as presaging the versatility of his hero. Philostratus subjoins that the natives say that Apollonius was a child (*paîda*) of Zeus, but "he calls himself son of Apollonius." It is not even hinted but positively excluded that he "was born of

a virgin." The meteoric portents "in the heavens" reduce to this: "the natives say that just as he was born a thunderbolt, seeming to be going to fall on the earth, was carried up in the ether and disappeared on high"—just an ordinary fancy after the fact and symbolizing future distinction, as interpreted by Philostratus.

He "appeared after death to an incredulous believer." Verily, but in a *dream* only! The youth "fell asleep," after praying for nine months that "Apollonius would clear up the doctrine about the soul," then "starting up from rudely broken slumber and streaming with perspiration" he cried, "I believe thee." His companions asking what was the matter, he said, "See ye not Apollonius the sage, that he is present with us, hearkening to our discourse and reciting wondrous words about the soul"? They though see nothing. The youth says, "He seems to come to converse with me alone concerning what I believed not," and then quotes to them what Apollonius said. All a mere dream, such as any one might have of a revered teacher, and told as a dream, of course with some rhetorical embellishment.

He "ascended into heaven bodily." Philostratus gives three stories of his death: first, that he came to his end in Ephesus, tended by two handmaids; second, that it was in Lindus, where he entered into the temple of Athena and disappeared within; third, that it was still more wonderful, in Crete, where he came to the temple of Dictynna late at night; the guardian dogs, though fierce, fawned upon him, but the guardian men seized and bound him as a wizard and robber; at midnight he loosed his bonds, and calling witnesses ran to the temple doors, which opened wide and then closed after receiving him, while rang out a voice of maidens singing, "Ascend from earth, ascend to heaven, ascend." The story is told by Philostratus merely as a story, not as a fact; its symbolic meaning is manifest.

This same note of exaggeration sounds through Conybeare's translation of Philostratus, and almost converts it into a tendence-writing. Thus he says, "Apollonius heals a demoniac boy," but Apollonius had naught to do with it; the actor is "one of the sages," the Indian sages; Apollonius is not mentioned in the chapter (XXXVIII, Bk. III). "The sage" means the Indian sage, who moreover is not even said to heal the boy, but merely to address a threatening letter to the "ghost,"¹—nothing is said of the result. Conybeare regularly speaks of Apollonius as "the sage," but not

¹ εἰδωλον, *idol*; observe that "the demon," possessing the boy, is also called *idol*, the term regularly used to denote the gods of pagandom.

Philostratus, who says regularly "the man" (of Tyana). Another "miracle of healing a lame man" turns out to be setting a dislocated hip; "but their hands having massaged the hip, upright of gait the youth went." Conybeare says "immediately," but not Philostratus. "And another man had had his eyes put out, and he went away having recovered the sight of both of them." Philostratus says, "And one having been flowing as to his eyes (*ophthalmō erryēkōs*) went away all having in them light." The reference seems to be to bleared, rheumy,² weak or watery eyes cured by the manipulations of the Indian sages. "Another had his hand paralyzed but left their presence in full possession of the limb." Philostratus says "another being weak in his hand, went away strong" (*egkrates*, empowered),—as well he might with no miracle. "Abaris who traveled on a broomstick through the air... is rivaled in his enterprise by Apollonius"; but Philostratus merely says that "to some occurred the report of Abaris of old, and that he [Apollonius] might launch into something similar, but he [Apollonius] without even declaring his mind to Damis set sail with him for Achaia."

Examples of this tendency could be multiplied almost *ad libitum*. Undoubtedly Philostratus means to cast a glamour of the extraordinary over his hero (though apparently avoiding any unequivocal affirmation of the miraculous): he tells many traveler's tales and sets down all sorts of popular stories, mainly of supernatural insight, foresight, and second sight. Such legends gather round many or all notable characters, and many not notable. "Heaven lies about us in our infancy," and our neighbor the rest of the time. No one would think of denying the historicity of Jesus, *merely* because miraculous legends had gathered about him. In *Ecce Deus* (pp. 78-79) I have distinctly disclaimed any such notion. The point is that there must be *independent indications of historicity*. The legends themselves are *not* evidence. If the independent evidences be present, the legends make no difference,

² The verb *rheo*, to flow, whence *rheum* and derivatives, was regularly used to denote such conditions, as well as its derivatives *rhyas* and others. To interpret the words "having been flowing at the eyes" to mean "who had had his eyes put out" is like interpreting the phrase "who had been bleeding at the lungs" to mean "who had had his lungs cut out." Besides, the position of the healing between two others, one of a dislocated joint, the other of a feeble hand, shows clearly that it belongs to a series of "minor surgeries."—In Book I, C. X, Philostratus tells of a man who "supplicates the god [Asklepios] to give him the one of his eyes that had flowed out (*exerryēkota*)," for his wife had "knocked out one of his eyes, having stabbed in her brooch-pins." Observe that the historian says just what he means: the stab had ruptured the eye, the humors had literally *flowed out*; hence the prefix *ex*, which is not used in the present case, where the eyes seem to have been affected with chronic rheum, but did not flow *out*.

but in their absence the legends cannot attest. Here is the distinction with the difference. No such independent witness has been presented for "the historical Jesus."

On the contrary, the whole body of evidence thus far adduced bears strongly against the historical character. When Petrie would prove Apollonius historical, what does he do? "Recognizing how easily the marvelous is accredited to any striking character, we place our faith more on the internal evidence of congruity." The "historical detail" is for Petrie the "basis for our acceptance of the authenticity of the narrative." He then sets forth six pages of details and "in all this mass of allusions to contemporary history and details of journeys there is not a single misplacement or confusion" (*Personal Religion in Egypt*, pp. 39-45). This is respectable reasoning. Will any one hold that it can be applied to the Gospels? Even in a single detail? Surely not. The cases are polar opposites. The stories in Philostratus do not "read exactly like chapters out of the Gospels." A statement could hardly be more misleading; they read neither exactly nor at all like Gospel chapters. In fact, it may be strongly recommended to the unbiased inquirer to read Philostratus, if he would form a judgment. The whole atmosphere is so totally foreign to the evangelic that he may be trusted to perceive that if one is history the other is not. Philostratus shows us clearly enough how a wonder-loving age would write about a remarkable revivalist, an impressive personality, an overmastering man, who lived in waxing fame and reverence for nearly one hundred years, whose disciples followed him from shore to shore and honored him almost as a god ("he came near being deemed both demoniac and divine," Phil., I, 2). The contrast with the case of Jesus is too broad to state in a few words, and it points directly away from the theory of "the historical Christ."

2. "Jesus, our authors affirm, was an astral myth." But Smith is one of "our authors" and, as Conybeare knows, affirms nothing of the kind. At best, Conybeare's statement is one-third false.

3. "In these earliest documents [Mark] Jesus is presented quite naturally as the son of Joseph and his wife Mary, and we learn quite incidentally the names of his brothers and sisters." Who by reading this is prepared for the fact that Mark *never* mentions Joseph, who is named only in Matt. i. and ii., Luke i., ii., iii., (acknowledged late fictions), iv. 22, and John i. 45, vi. 42, also late? Moreover, Mark introduces Jesus *without any family reference* and only in two passages refers to any "brethren," in one of which Jesus declares his mother and brethren to be spiritual; the other passage, in which

they are named, seems to be a mere philologic play on the stem *Nasar*, present both in the Syriac for carpenter and in *Nasarene*. This whole subject of "Jesus's brethren" I have discussed in *The Open Court* (1912, pp. 744-755), showing that there lies in the term no argument for any historicity of Jesus.

4. "In Matthew v. Jesus went up into a mountain," p. 20. Matthew there says "the mountain," a very different thing, showing that he is not speaking of a physical mount but of "the mount" of legislative authority, as the king ascends the throne. What more unnatural than for a man to ascend a physical mountain when the multitudes came to be taught?

5. W. B. Smith is named among those that "insist on the esoterism and secrecy of the cryptic society which in Jerusalem harbored the cult," p. 31. W. B. Smith does naught of the kind, has never said aught of any such society in Jerusalem.

6. Conybeare quotes (p. 32) as a "naïve declaration" a statement on page 74 of *Ecce Deus*; but he fails to hint the reasons there assigned. This misleads the reader, who naturally thinks of naïveté as unsupported by reasons.

7. "W. B. Smith's hypothesis of a God Joshua" (p. 35). Conybeare knows I have made no such hypothesis, nor ever used such phrase. He is seeking to identify my views with Mr. Robertson's, though knowing quite well they are widely distinct.

8. Conybeare says the phrase "the things concerning Jesus" "refers as the context requires to the history and passion of Jesus of Galilee." But Mr. Conybeare's peers, as Loisy and Soltau, admit that it can not, but must refer to a "religious doctrine," as I have contended.

9. "The name Jesus, according to him, means . . . Healer." How can Conybeare write thus? Where have I said that Jesus means Healer? In *Ecce Deus* (p. 17) it is stated that Jesus was "practically identical with Jeshua, now understood by most to mean strictly Jah-help, but easily confounded with a similar form J'shu'ah, meaning *deliverance*, Saviour," also "it suggested *healing* to the Greek, "its meaning, which was *felt* to be Saviour" (p. 16). Similarly, in *Der vorchristliche Jesus* (p. 38), where it is said explicitly that "Jesus in the Gospels means naught else than *Saviour*." Zahn (whom even Conybeare must respect) sets forth (*Evangelium des Matthäus*, 75-76) clearly that "in assigning a reason for the choice of the name (Jesus) the notion of *saving*, *salvation*, *saviour* is employed." I have never said that Jesus properly meant *healer*, but only that in the consciousness of the early Christian in the Gospels

and other old Christian literature it signified *Saviour*, it was *understood* to mean Saviour. Such was *not the scientific* but the *popular* etymology. This is correct, in spite of Conybeare, as admitted by Zahn and others. Conybeare adds, "note, in passing, that this etymology is wholly false, and rests on the authority of a writer so late, ignorant, and superstitious as Epiphanius." Brave words these, but not discreet. Conybeare seems to forget that Justin Martyr, nearly 200 years before Epiphanius, and held in high repute by historicists, says (Ap. I, 33, C), "But Jesus, a name in the Hebrew speech, in the Greek language means *Soter*" (Saviour); also (Ap. II, 6), "Jesus has both the name and significance of man and Saviour"; also (Iren. II, 34, 3), "But his Greek name [corresponding to his Hebrew name Jesus], which is *Soter*, that is Saviour."³ Still earlier Philo (in *De Nom. Mut.*) translates Jesus more accurately by *Lord's Salvation* (*Iēsous de, sōtēria kyriou*) which is tantamount to Saviour. Enough, the statements of Conybeare are quite reckless.—It may be added that Usener (for whom Dr. Conybeare may entertain some respect) derives the divine name Jasos, almost indistinguishable from Jesus, from *iasthai*, to heal (*Götternamen*, p. 156). It seems incredible, then, that the Greeks should not have *understood* Jesus to mean Healer, Saviour.

10. "It would appear, then, that Apollos was perfectly acquainted with the personal history of Jesus." For this important thesis, where does Conybeare offer the faintest semblance of proof? The word "then" suggests that reasons have been given; but what are even hinted?

³ It is indeed plain from countless passages in Irenæus that Jeshu, Jesus, Soter, Salvator were all practically identical in the early Gnostic-Christian consciousness. Yea, the case is even clearer yet. In Iren. IV, 30 is a notable passage: "His name is glorified among Gentiles. But what other name is glorified among Gentiles than our Lord's, through which is glorified the Father and is glorified man? Both because His own Son's it is, and by Him was made man, His own he calls it. Even as, if a king himself paints his own son's portrait, he justly calls it his own portrait, for two reasons, both because it is his own son's and because he himself made it: So also Jesus Christ's name, which through all the world is glorified in the church, the Father confesses to be His own, both because it is His Son's and because He Himself writing it gave it unto salvation of men. Since therefore the Son's name is the Father's own name, etc." What is this wondrous name common to Father and Son? Let Harvey answer: "Irenæus refers, I imagine, to the name Jesus—JHVH JESHU'AH—*Jehovah, Salvation*." Indeed, there is no doubt; says the Apostle, "and vouchsafed him the name that is above every name, that in the name of *Jesus* every knee may bow etc." (Phil. ii. 9f.) Now it is Jehovah alone that declares, "Unto me every knee shall bow etc." (Is. xiv, 23), and only the Tetragram JHVH is "*the name above every name*." In some way then the names Jesus and Jehovah must be united in one. How? In the oft recurring phrase quoted by Harvey (II, 200). Remember that *Jeshu* (יֵשׁוּ) is the regular form of the name Jesus in the later Hebrew, as in *b. Sanh. 103^a, 107^b*; Irenæus alludes to it as consisting of two and a half letters (II. 34, 4).

11. The rest of page 38 is mere wild assertion. The passage in Luke xxiv. 19 I have treated sufficiently in *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, p. 4; repetition is unnecessary.

12. Conybeare thinks it "verges on absurdity" to refer "the things concerning the Jesus" (Mark v. 27) to "the doctrine about Jesus." He gives no reason, merely affirming the hemorrhagic woman was hysterical, and that "in the annals of faith-healing such cures are common." On the contrary, I hold that "the doctrine about the Jesus" is meant, that the healing is purely symbolic like all other healings, that the cure of the unclean world by faith is set forth. The hysterical interpretation of Conybeare does not seem worthy of a mature mind. The Gnostics saw clearly enough that this woman typified something, and they identified her with the twelfth Aeon. For this Irenaeus charges them with inconsistency, perhaps correctly, but he does not defend the historicity of the incident; indeed he seems inclined to think there might be some symbolic interpretation, for he says: "If indeed eleven Aeons were said to have been affected with incurable passion, but the twelfth was cured, it would be plausible to say the woman was a type of them" (II, 34, 1).

13. Conybeare's discussion of the Paris papyrus is simply confident assertion, no proof is attempted. He tells us Dieterich says it can not be older than the second century B. C., but he forgets to add that Dieterich ascribes it definitely to the Essenes who are the "pure men" in question. "But who are the *pure men*?... Let us say it at once: they are Essenes or Therapeutae" (Dieterich's *Abraxas*, p. 143). Here then among these Essenes, somewhere near the beginning of our era, we find Jesus invoked in exorcism as "the God of the Hebrews." Deissmann can find no way to evade this but by supposing the passage to be interpolated; but the context forbids this conjecture, the passage is necessary to the structure. This testimony to the pre-Christian Jesus remains unshaken.

14. Conybeare's discussion of the epithet Nazorean is too slight for consideration; its force lies in such phrases as "Smith jumps to the conclusion that the Christians were identical with the sect of Nazoræi mentioned in Epiphanius as going back to an age before Christ." If the reader will refer to the original discussion (in *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, pp. 54-69), he will see how cautiously inch by inch this jump was effected. That discussion cannot be repeated here, nor the many elaborate articles since written on the subject. Suffice it that the theses of *Der vorchristliche Jesus* have not been shaken and are coming to clearer and more general recog-

dition. Read the recent monographs of Abbott and Burrage to see how "unhasting, unresting" the opinion of critics is turning into position.

In a footnote Conybeare seems to concede guardedly the pre-Christianity of the Nazoræi (which, in fact, it is wildness to deny: Epiphanius may be many undesirable things, but he was surely a diligent inquirer; his witness may be late, but it is in ample measure; he would never have borne it and tried vainly to evade it, had it not been essentially correct. To quote overstrong words, which Conybeare at least will recognize, written about this very matter, "the Christians were great liars, but they never lied against themselves"). If so, then farewell to the derivation of Nazarean from Nazareth, and farewell to Christianity as an emanation from a man Jesus, for, says Conybeare, "the Nazoræi of Epiphanius were a Christian sect." The Matthæan derivation, now generally surrendered, is simply part of the scheme of historization everywhere and increasingly present in the later portions of the New Testament. When Conybeare speaks of "Smith's contention that he was a myth and a mere symbol of a God Joshua," he is confounding Smith with some other—such is his prejudice against accuracy.

15. Similarly on page 45, where he declares Smith insists "that the miraculous tradition of Jesus's birth was coeval with the earliest Christianity," we have another of Conybeare's pious imaginations. I have uniformly spoken of both the Matthean and the Lucan "miraculous tradition" as late, very late—perhaps not earlier than the second century.

16. Similarly, p. 58, Conybeare says of an "ancient solar or other worship of a babe Joshua, son of Miriam," that "it looms large in the imagination of. . . . Professor W. B. Smith." As I have never anywhere alluded to any such "ancient worship," it would seem that Conybeare is at best a diviner of sub-conscious imaginations.

17. Apparently Conybeare urges no arguments against the symbolic interpretation of the miracles, especially of demon-expulsion. He merely complains that Smith's exposition "is barely consonant with the thesis of his friends," which may be irritating but does not touch the logical situation, since Smith is not accountable for any thesis but his own. But on page 67 he quotes half of page 57 from *Ecce Deus*, in which it is argued that the accepted view of Jesus as establishing a new religion by sending out disciples to heal a few lunatics is quite absurd, and it is asked, "Is that the way the sublimest of teachers would found the new and true religion?"

Conybeare comments: "In the last sentence our author nods and lapses into the historical mood; for how can one talk of a mythical Joshua being a teacher and founding a new religion—of his sending forth the apostles and disciples?" Doubtless Smith sometimes "nods," as do his betters; but he rarely snores so visibly as Conybeare in this comment. A child can see that in speaking of Jesus as "sending forth the apostles" I was not stating my own view, but the accepted view, which I regard as ludicrous. Conybeare would not allow Euclid to use a *reductio ad absurdum*. On page 68 Conybeare exaggerates immeasurably the prevalence of exorcism among Jews and pagans, and finds it strange that the Protochristians should use symbolic language about demons, which might be misunderstood. But such symbolic language was very common; it was a staple of discourse (as is clearly set forth in *Ecce Deus*, e. g. on page 116); it was certainly used about diseases quite as frequently as about exorcism; it harmonizes every way with all the historical conditions, with the temper of the time and clime. Mueller long ago (1861) interpreted the miracles of Apollonius as symbolic, and Kayser (whose text Conybeare uses) adopts the interpretation. The fact is, the symbolism is often so transparent as to be quite unmistakable. After seeing the solution of a riddle or rebus, you cannot help seeing it.

How scandalous is the exaggeration of Conybeare may be clearly seen from two points of view. First, the expulsion of demons appears in the New Testament as a most remarkable exhibition of supernatural power, as a distinctive sign of the divine might of the "new teaching" or teacher. But if "exorcists, Jewish and pagan, were driving out demons of madness and disease at every street corner," then where was the wonder? If everybody was doing it, what impression would it have made, what attention have excited? It seems strange also that classic literature should be practically devoid of allusion to such a dominant element of daily life, stranger that the revered Baur should write: "The belief in possession by demons, at least in the form prevailing among the Jews, cannot, it seems, be found in Greek and Roman authors of the time of Philostratus, even as to the Greek religion also the notion of evil demons remained almost wholly foreign" (*Apollonius und Christus*, 143). Still more, how amazing that Acts gives no example of such a demon-expulsion, not even in xvi. 18, and that early Christian literature can furnish no example. But, secondly, consider Apollonius, the master magician and wonder-worker. Surely he must have surpassed all others in demon-expulsion. How-

ever, Philostratus can tell of only one such expulsion, or at most two or three, and these are so transparently mere figures of speech, as Müller and Kayser have already perceived and shown, that they can not be counted at all. Here then the chief of all thaumaturges of the day lives and works well-nigh a hundred years without expelling a demon! Or even suppose he did expel half a dozen, one every fifteen years, while others were driving them out "at every street corner"! Would not such a prince of miracle-mongers be straightway discharged for "inefficiency"? It is clear as day that Conybeare's statements are the merest caricatures, not worth the least consideration.

18. Page 69. Conybeare complains again of want of harmony between "Mr. Robertson and Mr. Drews" and "Prof. W. B. Smith." Well, what of it?

19. Page 74. Conybeare rejects Smith's "thesis that the Christian religion originated as a monotheist propaganda," as "an exaggeration, for it was at first a Messianic movement or impulse among Jews etc." He offers no proof, nor says what Jews, whether in Judea or in the Dispersion. The steadily accumulating evidence points to the Dispersion and away from Judea and shows more and more clearly that the Christian was one form (itself having a dozen sub-forms) of the great monotheistic movement in the Judeo-Greco-Roman world, especially on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, proclaimed by zealous apostles from shore to shore, and in a more or less definite type of discourse, such as Norden exhibits on pages 6, 7 of his *Agnostos Theos* (1913) under the impressive title of "the Jewish-Christian Ground-Motive." The zeal and energy of this propaganda are attested in Matthew xxiii. 15, "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte." How reconcile with this incontestable fact of the wide-spread monotheistic preaching and mission (*Missionspredigt*, Norden) the notion that Christianity emanated from a personal focus, a "carpenter of Nazareth"? Impossible. "A Messianic movement" could be and was a militant monotheism. It was God under the aspect of Heavenly Messiah, of preexistent Son-of-Man, who was the "Coming One" (*Habba*). now to be revealed to the coming world. To see in this movement a semi-political semi-racial agitation of a few Galilean crackbrains is to view history through an inverted telescope. The notion finds no sanction in any well-ascertained facts. As far back as our knowledge extends the goal of the movement is the monotheization of the world.

20. Page 79, Conybeare speaks of "the naïf figure of Jesus, as

presented in the Synoptic Gospels." Herewith compare the chapter on "The Characterization of Jesus" in *Christianity Old and New*, by Conybeare's sober sympathizer, Bacon of Yale, who seems to admit not one trace of naïveté in the thoroughly "conventionalized figure." It is worth adding that Salvatore Minocchi, the leader of Italian and a leader of European modernists, in *Il Panteon* (1914), a study of the "Origins of Christianity," while still championing at great length "the historical Jesus," admits that for Mark even "he is almost throughout a supernatural being," and that the two capital Pauline testimonies (1 Cor. xi. 23-25 and xv. 3-7) are interpolations: "such passages were assuredly never written by Paul"—all of which has already been proved in *Ecce Deus*. Thus leaf by leaf the roses fall. If one would set forth great things by small, Minocchi's abandonment of these three strongholds might be likened to the simultaneous surrender of Belfort, Verdun, and Warsaw.

21. Pp. 84-85, Conybeare sets forth his view of Mark's Gospel, protesting against the notion that Mark represents Jesus as divine, insisting that it is John that deifies. But all this is unsupported assertion; Conybeare never grapples nor comes to close quarters. He passes by the minute discussion in *Ecce Deus*, with a mere "we rub our eyes." Indeed, a hopeful symptom, but Bacon does better; he not only rubs but also opens. While of course not accepting the thesis of *Ecce Deus*, he goes far in that direction. He tells us that the "distinctive and characteristic trait (of Jesus) in Mark is authority," he might have said "divine power," for this "authority" is instantly recognized and obeyed as supreme. From beginning to end "Mark presents his central figure as in heroic proportions. The 'mighty works' of Jesus occupy the foreground." "'Christ' or 'Son of God,' rather than 'Lord,' is Mark's distinctive messianic title," "but this paragraph [xii. 35-37, where Ps. cx. 1 is quoted to show that Christ is 'Lord,' throned in heaven] fully expresses his own Christology, and sounds the keynote for his own conception of Christ. Jesus, from the time of his adoption by the Spirit and the heavenly Voice [i. e., from the first of Mark] became a super-human authority. He already sits at the right hand of God." All this is correct, only still too mildly drawn. Jesus is in Mark plainly an over-earthly being from the very start; the Gospel opens without hint of earthly origin of its hero. As to the title "Son-of-God," who does not know that it has been used for hundreds of years to designate more or less clearly a certain emanation or person of the supreme God, hardly inferior in dignity or power to that God him-

self? All attempts to minimize the meaning of the term are abortive.

As to John, of course it was never said and never meant that he reduced the power or majesty of the Logos, but only that he strove to humanize and sentimentalize, that he sought to ascribe distinctly human traits, and to add a so-called affective hue to his representations, as when he says "Jesus wept." This attempted humanization and sentimentalization runs through the Fourth Gospel and is plain to open eyes.

22. Page 88, Conybeare admits that Christianity was "a protest against idolatry, a crusade for monotheism," "when we pass outside the Gospels." If so, then it must be our own fault that we do not find it in the Gospels themselves. Christianity can hardly be one thing outside and another thing inside the Gospels. The truth is that, as the Apostle puts it, "our Gospel is veiled." The whole healing and saving activity of Jesus in the Gospels is a "veiled" statement of the progress of the early Jesus-cult in redeeming humanity from the sin (of idolatry and its endless train of vices). According to the apocalypticist (Rev. xiv. 7), the "eternal Gospel" proclaimed to all the earth is monotheism pure and simple: "Fear God and give him glory."

From such dreary details one is glad to emerge more into the open in reviewing the next chapter (III) on the "Argument from Silence." Conybeare's discussion must of course contain much that is correct, yet it is vitiated at vital points by rash assertions and tendentious constructions. He tells us that Matthew and Luke "Rearrange, modify and omit," but adds that their handling of the Marcan and non-Markan documents is "inexplicable on the hypothesis that they considered them to be mere romances." But whoever said they considered them "mere romances"? On the contrary, they revered these documents as much more than historical, as deep religious poems and doctrinal treatises. But the fact that they did "re-arrange, modify, and omit" (nay more, unquestionably, invent wholesale, and contradict each other at will, as Conybeare will not deny) shows clearly as possible that they did *not* regard these documents as authoritative or binding in any historic sense. So much we may uncompromisingly maintain.

Luke's foreword strongly confirms our thesis. True, he says naught about "Osiris dramas" nor yet again about "the facts about Jesus," a fine phrase of Conybeare's own invention; his language is suspiciously vague, certainly not what this modern historicist would have used. For Conybeare speaks thrice of Jesus in six

short lines; Luke does not once use the word in his prologue. Luke says naught about any history, he speaks of "setting in order matters fully accredited among us." The word *peplērophorēmenōn* is rendered *vollgeglaubten* by the German master Holtzmann. If you render it "fulfilled" or "fully established," the meaning is not altered; the reference is not to a biography but to a body of teaching, for these "matters" (*pragmata*) "delivered us those who from the first were eyewitnesses and servants"—of what? of biographic details? Nay, but "of the word" (the doctrine); and why does Luke undertake this task? That Theophilus (God-loved) may know the surety of—what? of a set of biographic incidents? Nay, but "of the doctrines (*logōn*) about which thou wast taught orally." Sane commentators—who is saner than Holtzmann?—recognize that it is here a question of *doctrine*: "The closing words give the whole account a doctrinal purpose," and he renders *logōn* as above, by *Lehre* (doctrine).

Herewith then tumbles this whole chapter III of *The Historical Christ*. It makes no difference whether there were thirteen or three hundred "such documents"; their primitive object was not history but *Logos, doctrine*, which they set forth in various ways, by sayings, by *pārales*, by edifying arguments, by symbolic stories. The idea of Luke, or any other evangelist, as crowding his pages with every form of historic impossibility (as Conybeare cannot deny) and at the same time gravely concerned and deprecating that Theophilus should get any historically inexact "information about Jesus," is one of the most amusing conceits in literature. Does not every one know that his chapters I and II are elaborate inventions contradicting Matthew's similar invention at every point? Does not even Loisy recognize the prevalence of symbolism in Luke, whom he calls "the great symbolist"? Yet this patent doctrinaire appears to Conybeare as a painstaking documentary biographer! We might have expected the like from Ramsay.

This chapter and the whole argument from "independent documents," upon which Conybeare has put forth his most earnest efforts, are disabled by two immedicable maladies: the documents, whether two or a hundred, are not independent, and they are not biographic. They proceed from schools of religious and theosophic thought, their authors are quite unknown, no one knows how many hands have been at work on each; there is not one sentence that may not have undergone revision after revision; the marks of extensive and intensive redaction, of insertion and excision, of every form of overworking, are still visible on nearly every page, and

to speak of such "documents," no part of which we certainly possess in any primitive form, as independent witnesses is to use words apart from their meaning. These schools were indeed not all alike, they differed among themselves like the colors of the spectrum, widely, more widely, and less widely; this fact complicates the general phenomenon but does not change its nature. Conybeare admits (p. 103) that John's Gospel "is half-docetic." Yet it certainly strives to humanize and sentimentalize beyond the Synoptics; it is especially concerned to exhibit Jesus as "the Logos become flesh." On its face this object is historization, to show forth a divinity in the guise of flesh; the very reverse of Conybeare's view that it was to exalt a pure human being into a God.

Conybeare refers (p. 104) to Ignatius's treatment of Docetism. "I too have not been idle," but have discussed the matter through pp. 351-364 of *The Open Court* (June, 1913), with the unequivocal result that the witness of Ignatius is directly and decisively against the historicists, a conclusion reached quite independently by no less a scholar than Salomon Reinach. If Conybeare will uphold his position he must answer these arguments. It is not hard to show that Ignatius represents a *growing dogma* of the humanity of Jesus, that he strives mightily to defend it against an earlier view, and that he has *no historic data* at command to support it, though he might have been alive at the supposed crucifixion, though he might have known the apostles themselves, and though he lived but a short distance from Galilee. Docetism was not primitive Christianity, it was itself a secondary growth, and yet Jerome attests that it flourished "while the apostles were still alive on earth, while the blood of Christ was still fresh in Judea." Conybeare's interpretation of Docetism is quite indefensible.

Page 111, he entirely misinterprets the hostility of the Judean Jew to the Jesus-cult. It was the universalism of the "new doctrine" (Mark i. 27), its breaking down the wall between Jew and Greek, its abolition of the Jewish prerogative, that was naturally enough born in the Dispersion but proved less and less acceptable to the Jews of Judea, where naturally nationalism was far more intense. Hence the *Jews of Jerusalem* are said to have crucified the Jesus, that is, they rejected the Jesus-cult with scorn and disdain. The Judean stumbled, was "offended," at the notion of the Saviour-God of the "new doctrine," the Jesus-cult; hence the plain words attributed to Jesus: "Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me" (Matt. xi. 6). The whole story of the Passion is an additament to the primitive Gospels; it is not in Q, as admitted

even by Harnack. All the historic facts in the case fall into order from this point of view.

In the following pages of Conybeare's work much seems wisely written, especially his frank recognition of the "brotherhood" of "monotheists of the Jewish type" "all about the Mediterranean," who were "something besides" in that "they accepted a *gospel*.... about a Lord Jesus Christ"—all of which I might have written myself, had mine been the pen of such a ready writer. It was pondering just such facts that forced me to the general conception of multifocal Protochristianity as first set forth in *Der vorchristliche Jesus*. How any one can interpret such facts as implying the emanation of Protochristianity from a Galilean carpenter crucified a few years before, we shall understand when we learn how an irregular polygon grows out of a point.

In passing it is worth while to note that "Van Manen never for a moment questioned the historical reality of Jesus." Certainly not, for the dark overtook him midway; "the season of figs was not yet." After opposing Loman's view of "Pauline Questions" strenuously for years, with singular nobility and plasticity of mind Van Manen reversed his spear and drove it directly against the dogma he had so valiantly defended. Had his health been spared a few years longer, he might have written not only the third article in the *Hibbert* on "Did Paul write Romans?" but have accepted the radical view as thoroughly as now does his learned compatriot Bolland.

Page 123, Conybeare assumes (without any proof) everything in dispute, declaring that "all these documents are independent of one another in style and contents, yet they all have a common interest—namely, the memory of a historical man Jesus." I traverse this pleading *in toto*. It is not true that any of these documents has for its "interest" "the memory of a historical man Jesus." The "common interest" in question is not a "memory" at all, neither of an historical nor of an unhistorical man Jesus. The "common interest" is in a dogma or body of dogmas, a "doctrine *about* the Jesus," a *Religionsanschauung*, as Soltau, reviewing *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, admits. It is notorious that no one can learn from Acts and Epistles anything about Jesus that has biographic content, it is all of dogmatic import. The primitive preaching of Peter and Paul tells us nothing about the life of Jesus, but primarily only that God had "raised up Jesus," where "raised up" (*anestēsen*) is used in its regular (Old Testament and Septuagint) sense of "set up," "establish," "install," "inaugurate," the allusion being to the "new doc-

trine," the Hellenized "monotheistic Jesus-cult" (Deissmann). Afterwards, as the process of historizing went on apace, this primitive proclamation was expanded and pictorialized into a story of "resurrection from the dead," where "raised up" has been dislocated in its reference. All this is set forth in the article "Anastasis" in *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, and in substance it is now powerfully confirmed in Bousset's *Kyrios Christos*.

The story of the crucifixion is a similar development, a pictorial representation or symbolization of the rejection of that same Jesus-cult by the Jews of Jerusalem. The proof of this is already elaborated in an essay written in 1913 and perhaps soon to appear in print. But whether these particular interpretations be quite correct is not the real point, which is that the "documents" in question were not primarily, in their original form, historical, nor was their "common interest" historical, but dogmatic and doctrinal; as is clear from the fact that they tell us nothing of strictly biographic or historic scope, nothing that is not thus dogmatic and doctrinal, and from the further fact that they freely and everywhere mould the quasi-historical features to suit the doctrine under consideration.

Of course, no one denies the presence of these quasi-historical features, they are obvious; but perhaps in *every* instance they may be shown to be thus tendentious, to be free inventions, having generally symbolic but often purely poetic or dramatic function. As time went on, these fictions multiplied beyond measure, taking such romantic forms as in the first two chapters of Matthew and of Luke, and gradually all feeling for the original sense of the Gospel was lost, even as feeling for the primal meaning of the Greek myths was lost in bald Euhemerism. "It is curious to observe the treatment which the Greek myths met with at the hands of foreigners. The Oriental mind, quite unable to appreciate poetry of such a character, stripped the legends bare of all that beautified them, and then treated them, thus vulgarized, as matters of simple history." *Mutatis mutandis*, these words of Rawlinson fit exactly the case of Christianity, whose deplorable but natural and inevitable vulgarization has lasted to this day and in its totality constitutes the saddest sight that earth has ever shown the sun.

Page 124, Conybeare thinks it incredible that one tradition (much more six or seven) "should allegorize the myth of a Saviour-God as the career of a man, and that man a Galilean teacher, in whose humanity the church believed from the first." Verily! But in the final clause he quietly assumes the very thing to be proved, the very thing emphatically denied. The "church" did *not* believe

in the humanity of Jesus "from the first." No scintilla of proof can Conybeare show forth. The earliest evidences exhibit a "new doctrine" of a Saviour-God, of "Jesus raised up" by God as a Pro-Jehovah. The traces of gradual humanization are surprisingly abundant; numerous and *manifest*, too, are the *interpolations* made in the interest of the dogma of the humanity (as I have set forth in an elaborate essay soon to be published). But even in the second century the humanity was far from universally accepted. The *Teaching*, venerable and authoritative, knows nothing of it; neither does the learned Epistle of James; neither do other New Testament Scriptures; the most popular *Shepherd* of Hermas, issuing from and addressed to the inmost Roman Christian consciousness and esteemed as "inspired" by the highest authorities, knows nothing whatever of any earthly life of Jesus, whose name it never mentions. All these matters are only mentioned here but are treated at length in essays practically ready for the press.

Passing to "the Epistles of Paul," Conybeare apposes on page 126 two passages from Romans (i. 29-32) and I. Clement XXXV, 5, 6, to show that Clement used Paul. But the apposition is vain and belongs to a stage of literary criticism already overcome. The matter is treated in *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, not in eight short lines but in four long pages (170-173), and it is clearly shown that it is reckless to speak of Clement's quoting from Paul, since it is blindness not to recognize in Romans itself a quotation or at least a reminiscence of a Jewish Vidui or Confession for Day of Atonement, an acrostic of twenty-two sins, one for each letter of the Hebrew alphabet. To think of Paul's actually originating such a list in the midst of a heated argument is far more absurd than for a lawyer to extemporize a sonnet in a passionate appeal to a jury. Says T. Rendel Harris in his masterly monograph *The Teaching of the Apostles* (82 ff.): "There is ground for a suspicion that the Vidui of the Day of Atonement, the Catalogue of Vices in the Teaching, and the catalogue in the first chapter of Romans, are all derived from a lost alphabetical catalogue of sins." He might have added the catalogue in 2 Tim. iii. 2-5. Neither Clement nor Paul is originating, but both are quoting from common or related originals. Moreover the whole passage in Rom. i. 18-32, is on its face no original part of a letter to Romans ("Rome" in verse 7 is now admitted by Harnack and Zahn to be interpolated; the whole is no letter but a theological treatise, a precipitate of generations of debate), but is a part of the general "missionary preaching" of the monotheistic propaganda, a bitter denunciation of idolatry, itself

much revised, and has nothing whatever to do with any man Jesus or with the Gospel story.

"The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers," to which Conybeare refers p. 126, is certainly an extremely valuable compendium, for which we cannot be too grateful, but what is its logical worth may be inferred from its classifying the parallelism between Romans and Clement as "A a", to indicate the very highest degree of probability, whereas we have just seen there is no probability worth mention.

Conybeare's statement of the argument of my *Sæculi silentium* has so little relation to the facts in the case as to make any discussion well-nigh impossible. The causes (named on p. 130) of disappearance of Christian literature, alteration of creeds and rivalry of schools of thought, did indeed operate, but not against the canonical writings. To paraphrase the words already quoted, "The orthodox Christians were great destroyers, but they did not destroy their own." But this is not the worst of it. Conybeare seems to have mistaken quite the argument of *Sæculi silentium*. It is not there a question about writings that have disappeared, granted that they are countless; the question is about the works that have not disappeared, but abide with us even to-day. It is the century of such still extant works that is considered, and this century is found to be silent. It seems hardly possible that Conybeare could have read *Sæculi silentium* with any care. On pages 189-194 of *Der vorchristliche Jesus* the matter is clearly presented. The point is this. We have still with us copious works of that century, Clement, Polycarp, Barnabas, Ignatius, Hermas, Justin Martyr. These writers had frequent and urgent need for just such matter as lay at hand in the Epistle to Romans and other Paulines. They delighted in quotation, it was the staple of their argument; they seek diligently and with tears for authoritative utterances. If then they knew anything of our Romans, why did they pass it by in silence for a century? Such is the argument in *Sæculi silentium*, nor can it be answered by exclamation points and by caricature.

Like all other weapons of thought, the argument from silence must be used with discretion, but everywhere both in criticism and in daily life it is used and is indispensable. Hardly a book of criticism can you open but you find it employed somewhere. Thus, Munro (Iliad. I, XXVII) and Petrie. That in the case in hand it is used properly, and that it wounds mortally the prevalent notion about Romans, is plain to see in the intense anxiety of traditionalists to show that somewhere the silence has been broken; to every syl-

lable of the Fathers they apply the most sensitive microphone of criticism, if haply here or there they may detect the faintest echo from the Epistle.

Page 131 reveals a precious germ of truth, declaring that the supreme and exclusive interest of the Paulines, as well as the Paul (he might have added the Peter) of Acts, is "in the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Jesus," their author "manifests everywhere the same aloofness from the earthly life and teaching of Jesus." Nobly and bravely said, with enviable clearness and precision. But what other Epistle or (New Testament) writer after the Gospels shows any less aloofness from the early career of Jesus? Is not the supreme and exclusive interest of all "in the crucifixion, death, and resurrection?" And are not these all dogmatic moments? Is it not their doctrinal import with which the writers are exclusively concerned? One trivial amendment may be admitted. As the Paul of Acts never uses the word "crucify," and alludes to the crucifixion only in a section (xiii. 27-31) apparently inserted later in his speech, it cannot be said that he felt supreme interest in the crucifixion. Neither does Peter, who indeed says twice "whom ye crucified" (Acts ii. 36; iv. 10), and in iii. 14; v. 30; viii. 35 also alludes to the tragedy. But all of these notices seem to be secondary additions, and to form no part of the primitive preaching, which turned about the *Anastasis*, the uplifting, the establishment of Jesus as heavenly Son-of-Man, a pro-Jehovah and Lord Christ, quite independently of any resuscitation or any death. All this has been set forth in *Der vorchristliche Jesus* (pp. 71-106), also with some natural variation in Bousset's *Kyrios Christos* (pp. 1-92). The primitive notion is the *Anastasis* (Installation, *Erhöhung*—Bousset), from which the revival, death, crucifixion etc. have all been constructed *backward*, as in a dream. The first genuinely historic interest that we find is in the birth-stories of Matthew and Luke, admittedly late inventions.

The testimonies to a human birth of Jesus that Conybeare thinks to find in the Paulines are one and all mare's-nests. It seems strange he should cite such a phrase as "born of David's seed according to flesh" (Rom. i. 2), embedded in a concretion of dogmas impossible as a genuine address to Romans, and even there so obviously interpolated that our translators reached forward to the natural sequent (verse 4^c) and boldly wrote "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord," thereby impliedly recognizing the omitted words as inserted, though afterwards introducing them; while our revisers help themselves out by interpolating "even."

All such examples, and there are many, of dogmatic phrases disturbing the context labor under a strong antecedent suspicion of interpolation; many have been recognized as such by the sagest critics, who never dreamed of the present radical theory of an historicity. It is practically certain that many such are intrusions into the text, and it may very well be that all are. Undoubtedly the canonic scriptures have been revised and re-revised at many points in dogmatic interest; this none will deny. According to the chief methodological maxim, the law of parsimony, Occam's Razor, we *must* apply this admitted principle wherever we can, and introduce no other principle of explanation until absolutely necessary. Hence the historicist can prove nothing by any number of doctrinal phrases, easily detachable from their context and intelligible as interpolations, which fall out as soon as the text is shaken in discussion.

He must find some document wherein the human birth etc. are threads running through the whole web, which cannot be isolated nor understood as insertions. This he has not done, this he has not attempted to do, and in default hereof he is logically impotent.

The principal Pauline passages such as 1 Cor. xv. 3 ff.; ix. 1; xi. 23 ff.; x. 16, 17, have all been shown in *Ecce Deus* and elsewhere to bear witness not *for* but rather *against* the historical hypothesis. (Compare Guignebert, *Le Problème de Jésus*, for notable concessions.) Until these arguments are answered it is vain merely to point pathetically to these passages.

But on p. 134 Conybeare quotes 2 Cor. xii. 11, "In nothing came I behind the very chiefest apostles," and similar Pauline boasts. This seems suicidal. For admittedly Paul's Christianity, his seeing Jesus, the Lord, was a psychic process, a matter of intellect and not of sense experience; when he puts it in line with the apostles', what clearer indication could there be that their experience also was a matter of intellectual perception, of doctrinal comprehension, of spiritual intuition? Conybeare assumes everything, as so often, when he quietly identifies apostle with "personal follower of Jesus." But decidedly they were *not* "personal followers of the Jesus," the man of historic fancy. They were *missionaries* of "the doctrine about the Jesus," of the Judeo-Grecian monotheism, sent out from here and there all round the Mediterranean, the proclaimers now in the closet now on the housetops, as wisdom dictated, of the great *Missions-predigt*, set forth in type-form by Norden.

Naturally many of these twelve or seventy (both symbolic numbers) might have borne official relations to the early propa-

ganda, of which they were proud. Paul would seem to have been more or less independent, a marked individualist. It is doubtful whether the relations between the official apostles and the self-constituted apostle were ever so strained as would appear in a few passages in the Paulines; the Baurian antithesis did good service in its day, but its usefulness is over: "'Tis but a tent where takes his noonday rest" the critic that is addressed for the final and increasing truth. Apollos was another such apostle, also an individualist. For the more or less official apostles we have preserved in the *Teaching* a kind of manual of preaching and practice. It is a mere pious imagination on page 138 that "the older apostles prided themselves on their personal intercourse with Jesus"; it is not implied in 2 Cor. v. 12, nor elsewhere, save in the riotous fancy of the historicist. Page 138, Conybeare italicizes 2 Cor. v, 16, "*even though we have known Christ after the flesh,*" as one of "some texts which imply that Paul, if he did not actually see Jesus walking about on this earth, yet imply that he might have done so" (sic). But the highest exegetical authorities both conservative and liberal hold that it implies no such thing. Thus Heinrici (p. 172), citing Klöpfer, amends the elder view of Meyer and interprets thus: "Yea, if we considered even Christ himself fleshwise, if we misunderstood him and his kingdom totally" (as does the modern historicist), and (p. 174), "for *known* by no means presupposes *having seen*, but refers to a discursive cognition of the specific dignity of Christ." Notice also with what contempt Holsten dismisses such views as Conybeare's (*Ev. d. Paul. u. d. Petr.*, p. 432). The passage still remains obscure and questionable, but it affords no help to historicism.

On page 146 is mooted the question of the "brethren of the Lord." This matter has been discussed at much length elsewhere (in *The Open Court*) in my article on the "Kindred of Jesus and the Babylon of Revelation" and in my review of Loofs's "What is the Truth about Jesus?" According to the *Theologischer Jahresbericht* my position is there "skilfully defended against an able assailant," Kampmeier. Here be it only observed that had flesh-and-blood brother been meant, the phrase would have been "brother of Jesus" and not "brother of the Lord." Remember that Lord (*Kyrios*) is the Greek for Jehovah, also that Hegesippus quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.*, II, 23, 4-18) gives such an account of this James as makes it clear that he was "brother of the Lord" by virtue of his prodigious piety, and ridiculous to suppose that blood-kinship is meant; also that Origen expressly says he was "brother

of the Lord, not so much because of consanguinity or coeducation as because of his ethics and his doctrine" (*C. Cels.*, I, 47); also that in the Apostolic Constitutions, Book V, we read, "He that is condemned for the name of the Lord God is an holy martyr, a brother of the Lord." Now this James is said in Hegesippus's account to have suffered martyrdom. So, then, all the facts in the case are understood easily and naturally on the supposition that the reference is to religious pre-eminence, and on no other.

Page 146, Conybeare refers to the fact that in Mark iii. 31-35, it is implied of "his brethren" that they did not believe in him, and makes much of this apparent contradiction, as Kampmeier before him. But the solution is simple. There is no reason why "his brethren" should not be used by different writers or even by the same writer at different times under different conditions, in widely different senses. All of us do the like habitually. It was very natural in quasi-historic symbolism to speak of the Jews of Jerusalem as "his brethren" and as rejecting him, because the Jesus-cult was certainly Jewish in origin, though born in the Dispersion. Doubtless the Jews laid special claims to the idea, they were the protagonists of monotheism; although half-pagan "the monotheistic Jesus-cult" (Deissmann) was still theirs. And yet in the main they rejected it. Similarly Jerome speaks of the Church at Jerusalem as the mother of Jesus. Such figurative language was everywhere current in the Orient. The inconsistency then is only a seeming one. But even if the explanation were not so near-lying, the fact itself of the double sense would be incontestable; for in the *same* Gospel "brethren" *certainly* means "disciples," believers (at least so Magdalene understood it, John xx. 17-18), and just as certainly means *not* disciples but unbelievers (John vii. 5, "neither did his brethren believe in him"). Here, then, is no need to stumble, unless one positively prefers.

Page 148, Conybeare alleges that "blood relationship is always conveyed in the Paulines as in the rest of the New Testament" (and the *Christian World* of July 2 rolls the statement like a delicious morsel under the tongue), "when the person whose brother it is is named." How is it possible to characterize such a statement? The word in question (*adelphos*, brother) is used in the New Testament about 330 times, thus: Gospels 88, Acts 56, Paulines 132, the rest 54. In the Paulines it is used 130 times certainly in the figurative sense of religious or racial brother, the only two contested cases are those under review "brother of the Lord" (Gal. i. 19), "brethren of the Lord" (1 Cor. ix. 5). Conybeare has used "al-

ways" in the sense of *never*! Similarly in Acts it is used 54 times in the figurative sense, twice only in the literal sense ("Joseph was made known to his brethren," Acts. vii. 13; "James the brother of John," xii. 2). The Gospel usage is about equally divided. In the rest, the sense is figurative 51 times, perhaps literal thrice, twice of Cain's brother, 1 John iii. 12, and of Jude brother of James, Jude 1.

Page 148, "Smith withholds from his readers the fact that Jerome regarded James the brother of Jesus as his first cousin." He also withheld countless other facts just as irrelevant. Jerome's correct notion, agreeing with Origen's, of the meaning of the appellation "brother of the Lord," is not vitiated by his "Encratite rubbish" about first cousins and perpetual virginity of Mary; just as Conybeare's excellent investigations are but little impaired by *The Historical Christ*.

Page 152, Conybeare cites Col. ii. 14, concerning which it is sufficient to refer to *Ecce Deus*, pp. 88, 89, 197-201. Such phrases as are collated on pages 152, 153 have already been adequately noted.

Passing now into the broader campaign of "External Evidence" Conybeare complains that I have mangled Origen in quoting *contra Cels.*, I, 47. The "mangling" consists solely in indicating by dots the omission of irrelevant matter, as must often be done if books laden with citations are not to become unwieldy. Why quote 17 lines when only five are to the point? But on page 159 Conybeare controverts my statement that "the passage is still found in some Josephus manuscripts," and he calls Niese to witness that there are no such manuscripts. "By his neesings a light doth shine." "To-day the Captain is sober." I had incautiously accepted the statement of Schürer, the almost inerrant: "This passage occurs in some of our manuscripts of Josephus and ought therefore certainly to be regarded as a Christian interpolation which has been excluded from our common text" (*Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II, 18), unheeding the words of Origen's Benedictine editors: "to-day though, in Josephus-codices naught similar is found," and directly against my own wont, to verify every statement to the full extent of library and other resources at command.

But by this merciless massacre of a straggling metic, who richly deserved his fate, has Conybeare disturbed the march of the army? By no means. The peccant sentence was an *obiter dictum* unessential to the general argument. Conybeare, following Burkitt, who apparently follows the Benedictines, regards Origen's thrice-made averment as an error of Origen's commonplace book confusing

Ananus's murder of James with Ananus's own murder. Be that as it may—here is no room to test it. In any case the Josephine passage has passed quite beyond the stage of discussion represented by Conybeare and Burkitt. Harnack followed by Barnes has come to the defense of its Josephinity in a widely read article in the *Internationale Monatsschrift*, June, 1913, 1037-1068, which has rejoiced the hearts of historicists almost as much as his earlier reaction in the *Chronologie* tickled such as read no further than the *Vorrede*. But Harnack's structure has been pulverized by his own colleague E. Norden and scattered to the winds in an elaborate memoir in the *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische A., G. u. d. L.*, XXXI, pp. 637-666, after having already been generally rejected by his compatriots.

There has also just appeared in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift* an equally elaborate, if less rigorously reasoned, monograph by P. Corssen on "Die Zeugnisse des Tacitus und Pseudo-Josephus über Christus," 1914, pp. 114-140. All of the Burkitt-Harnack-Barnes contentions are most easily refuted (as I have shown fully in another connection),⁴ and the Josephine witness comes ever clearer to view as in every word one of the most manifest and unmistakable of all interpolations.

Page 160, Conybeare alludes to my contention that the Tacitus passage is spurious, but his misrepresentation of my argument is almost too gross for correction. Evidently he presumes that his readers will never see *Ecce Deus*, pp. 238-265, otherwise he surely would never have printed his own pages. Here it is enough, since Conybeare is quite beyond the pale of discussion, to quote one sentence from an able and honest though unsympathetic reviewer of *Ecce Deus*, Windisch, in the *Theol. Rundschau*: "The spuriousness of the Christ-passages in Josephus is strikingly demonstrated; fully as worthy of attention appear to me his arguments concerning Tacitus."

Page 161, Conybeare states, "It is practically certain that Clement writing about A. D. 95, refers to it" (Nero's persecution). Discreet traditionalists maintain no such thing. The sufferings referred to by Clement are ascribed to jealousy, he does *not* "record that a vast multitude perished in connection with the martyrdom of Peter and Paul," and there is not the remotest allusion to Nero. The passage is obscure and probably corrupt; the "Danaids and Dirkae" are bracketed by Lightfoot. Apparently the reference is to the *whole course of human history*, for he begins his list of the

⁴ *The Monist*, October, 1914, pp. 618-634.

disasters wrought "by envy and jealousy" with Cain and Abel, brings it on down gradually to Peter and Paul, and then says that "to these men (i. e., all the preceding examples, not merely Peter and Paul) of holy conversation was gathered a vast multitude of the elect"; on its face this gathering together was from the endless stretches of time from which he had taken so many examples. To see in it a reference to a Neronian persecution is to fly in the face of common sense. Compare the magnificent eleventh chapter of Hebrews (especially verses 32-40), of which Clement's chapters IV-VI may be regarded as a feeble echo. The "great multitude" corresponds to the "so great a cloud of witnesses" in Heb. xiii. 1.

As to "the cult of Augustus Cæsar" by the college of Augustals, as compared with the Plinian notice of hymns sung to Christ "as to God," little need be said, since Conybeare himself admits "one might perhaps hesitate about its implications," "if this letter were the sole record etc." Now it is precisely the existence of *any* "record" attesting the "purely human reality of the Christ or Jesus," that is called in question, and that historicists find it impossible to prove,—admittedly impossible, for such as Schweitzer and Noll content themselves with mere "probability." The case of Augustus is not nearly parallel, since there independent proof abounds.

Page 176, Conybeare says that in the "basal documents Mark and Q" "Jesus first comes on the scene as the humble son of Joseph and Mary to repent of his sins etc." What must be said of such writing? Is it reckless or merely "daring, bold, and venturesome"? Compare it with the *facts*, that Q as restored by Harnack contains no mention of any baptism of Jesus, that its first reference to Jesus declares he "was upborne into the wilderness by the Spirit to be tempted by the Devil, etc.," all of which is strictly supernatural; also that Mark says naught about Jesus as "humble son of Joseph and Mary," naught about his confessing sins but merely says "he came and was baptized, and immediately upon his going up from the water he saw the heavens rent asunder etc." The whole story is merely figurative, as Usener has clearly shown, and by no means testifies to historic fact. "Originally John the Baptist had borne only prophetic witness of Jesus. That satisfied neither those who had Jesus walk as God on earth nor those for whom Jesus was born as man" (*Das Weihnachtsfest*, 70). Hence the many varying accounts of the baptism, all of them dogmatic symbolic fictions. As complete corrective of these pages of Conybeare, it is enough to refer to a hostile work both honest and learned, to Bousset's *Kyrios Christos* (1913), where the practical immediacy of the worship of

Jesus as "a heavenly preexistent spiritual being descended from above" is strongly stressed, as well as the fact that the Gentile mission "was in flood before the conversion of Paul, whom it upbore on its current" (p. 92), and that the term Lord (*Kyrios*, Greek for Jehovah) was in use among the Gentiles, so far as we can see, from the very first. Conybeare here seems to represent a point of view already overcome.

Like may be said of his remarks on page 187 against the notion that the primitive propaganda was a militant monotheism. At this point he should read Norden's *Agnostos Theos*, as well as Acts, more carefully. A single passage may be quoted:

"I. THE SERMON ON MARS' HILL AS TYPE OF MISSIONARY
PREACHING.

I. THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN GROUND-MOTIVE.

"'Knowledge of God' was a concept known even to the religion of the prophets, but in the Christian religion it became central; in the rivalry of the Hellenic religions, including the Jewish-Christian, 'gnosis of God' was so to speak the password with which the missionaries plied their propaganda: he who brought the true gnosis—and only one could be the true—guaranteed to the believers the true God-worship also, for knowledge and worship (*eusebia*) were in these circles one" (p. 3). Compare herewith a modest footnote in *Ecce Deus* (p. 64): "Hence the genuine Protochristian terms 'gnosis' and 'gnostic.' Knowledge of God and worship of God are the two polestars of the Protochristian heavens." As soon as one sees that the repentance of the New Testament is turning from the sin (of idolatry and its concomitants), that faith towards God is the acceptance of monotheism (or "the monotheistic Jesus-cult"), and that the Kingdom of God is the community of his worshipers, of the world converted to monotheism, all the difficulties that trouble our author dissolve and vanish—and all of these things are treated in *Ecce Deus*. The cure for Conybeare's "Art of Criticism" would seem to be a little more science of criticism.

Page 190, complaint is made that Jesus is taken as human and historical where use is made of the phrase "he said unto them." By no means! We use the Old Testament phrase, "Thus saith Jehovah," with no suspicion that Jehovah is or was human or ever uttered such words. The ancient religionist regularly accredited his own ideas and expressions to his God. On the following pages, 191-198, Conybeare asks many questions, all of which answer them-

selves for the careful reader of *Der vorchristliche Jesus* and *Ecce Deus*. Dr. Conybeare also marvels much at many contentions in these volumes, which seem to have such frightful mien as to be hated needs but to be seen. When he grows familiar with their face, we shall see what follows. Meantime let us deprecate any reference to Habakkuk: "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish." But what if the historizing tendency of the Protochristians be queer and hard for Conybeare to understand? Does not Pindar say, "Truly, many things are wonderful"? The real question is not, Was it strange? but, Was it a fact? Did they actually historize? Let Conybeare himself answer, in his *Myth, Magic, and Morals* (p. 231): "Here we see turned into incident an allegory often employed by Philo." And again: "What is metaphor and allegory in Philo was turned into history by the Christians."

Herewith, then, having noted everything relevant that seems worth note, and more, we close the review of this book, a work of learning and power, not indeed bringing new arms into the fray but wielding old ones with strength and with skill. The author deserves and will receive the hearty thanks of all who were curious to see the very best that could be done with "rusty weapons" such as, the able historicist Klostermann says, "should be laid aside in the corner." Regarding the tone I rise to no point of order; Grat-tan has taught us that for some it is difficult to be severe without being unparliamentary. A reviewer in the *Academy* discovers in the book "a fine contempt"—and at times it might indeed appear to display a high disdain for certain things that other men of honor revere. However, the appearance is doubtless deceptive; it is only the zeal of the author that hath eaten him up. Besides, the radical criticism is certainly irritating (it is not every man that will write with Holtzmann: "I am too old now to unlearn everything and learn it all over another way: but for much new knowledge and for many a new insight I thank you most heartily"), and Dr. Conybeare intends to show it all the fairness it deserves. Nevertheless, with all its rare merits and its modest ambition to serve as a model of moderation, the book remains one of heat rather than of light, not always both cool and clear. The judicious admirers of the great scholar will not secretly rejoice as they read it, but they may repeat the consoling words of Pindar: "And yet, with fair fortune forgetfulness may come."